The Gift of Tongues

D. A. HAYES

DOCTOR HAYES' study includes a careful examination and evaluation of all Scripture instances and teaching concerning the Gift of Tongues; likewise a study of the manifestation and value of the "gift" in later Church history. It is thoughtful and candid, and is wrought out to a sane and logical conclusion.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_S0-BSX-147

The Gift of Tongues

BY

D. A. HAYES,

Professor of New Testament Interpretation in the Graduate School of Theology, Garrett Biblical Institute.

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN
NEW YORK CINCINNATI

Copyright, 1913, by
Jennings and Graham

First Edition Printed July, 1913
Reprinted December, 1914

TO

Gentle Critics and Rabid Opponents

AN OFFERING OF PEACE

CONTENTS

		PAGE
FOREWORD,	- - - - -	7
I.	THE GIFT AT CORINTH, -	11
II.	THE GIFT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, - - -	19
III.	THE GIFT AT PENTECOST, -	23
IV.	THE GIFT IN LATER CHURCH HISTORY, - - -	63
V.	REASONS FAVORING THE GIFT, - - -	94
VI.	BEST GENERAL ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GIFT, -	103
VII.	FOUR PAULINE PRINCIPLES OF CONTROL OF THE GIFT, - - -	107
VIII.	CONCLUSION, - - -	117

FOREWORD

This book runs a perfectly straight course through the New Testament and the later Church history. It is in line with both present and past experience. It may run crosswise to the opinions and prejudices of some people, but that will only prove that these opinions and prejudices are not themselves in line with the latest psychological research and the oldest available information. It surely is a recommendation to any New Testament exegesis that it finds the various authorities consistent with each other and all their statements substantiated in present-day occurrences. Human nature does not change through the centuries. In all our great cities and in remote rural districts there are revivals and survivals of all forms of the individual and community experiences of the

primitive days. No more interesting phenomenon of that sort has occurred in our generation than that of the revival of the gift of tongues in connection with religious services.

Many good people have been puzzled by it, and in doubt whether it were of God or altogether of the devil. Many pastors have been perplexed as to how to deal with individuals affected or afflicted with the gift in their own congregations or communities. Such people will be glad to know something of the past history of this phenomenon, and to have such an interpretation of the New Testament passages concerning it as will show their essential likeness to each other and their essential oneness with all the repetitions of the gift in the later history. This discussion is intended to be thoroughly sympathetic, reasonable, and irenic. Some very good people have had the gift of tongues. The Apostle Paul was one of them. Those who are

willing to shield themselves behind his example and authority in the use of the gift ought surely to be willing to be governed by the Pauline principles of control laid down in First Corinthians and set forth in this book.

We believe that it would be a great benefit to all those who are associated with the Tongues Movement, so-called, if they would read and ponder this discussion. However, it would be too much to hope that many of them will do so. In lieu of that, the book may be helpful to both preachers and people who would like to have some light upon one of the most interesting problems of the New Testament and one of the most interesting phenomena of the religious revivals of the last decade. If this book does not contain the last word of wisdom on this subject, it at least has some light to throw upon it, and its exegesis is as authoritative as any other that can be adduced in this field. There is no final

authority but that of the truth. It is in the hope that the book contains nothing but the truth, and therefore that it will be to the honor of the Holy Spirit and the edification of the general Church that we send it out with the prayer that it may be a blessing to all who read it.

The Gift of Tongues

⁂

Chapter I

IN THE CHURCH OF CORINTH

Our principal source of information concerning the apostolic gift of tongues is the fourteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Chapters 12, 13, and 14 form a distinct section of this Epistle, and the subject is, "Concerning Spiritual Gifts." In chapter 12 Paul sets forth their "Single Source and their Unity in Diversity." He makes a list of nine varieties of spiritual gifts, and he closes that list with "divers kinds of tongues and the interpretation of tongues" (12: 10). Toward the close of the chapter he makes a slightly different list, but closes as before with "divers kinds of tongues" (12: 28). Then he

asks, "Do all have each of these?" and his interrogations end, "Do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" (12: 30). In the twelfth chapter we have no explanation of the nature of this gift of speaking with tongues, and we learn only that it was possessed by some, not all, of the members of the Corinthian Church. Paul rates it among the spiritual gifts, but puts it at the end of the list as the least desirable among them.

In the thirteenth chapter Paul shows to the Corinthians "the superexcellent way," a way not limited to a favored few, but open to all—the way of perfect love. He begins that chapter by saying, "If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am become sounding brass" (13: 1). Further on he declares, "Whether there be tongues, they shall cease" (13: 8), while love never fails. Then follows the fourteenth chapter, which is mainly devoted to a comparison between prophesying

and speaking with tongues, and to the proof that prophesying is the more desirable gift. It is in this chapter that we get some clearer conception of the nature of the gift of tongues itself. We gather the following facts concerning it:

1. It is a gift of speech which is directed not to men, but to God (14: 2).

2. In itself it does not edify the general Church. Whatever edification there is in it is purely individual and personal (14: 4).

3. It is an unintelligible succession of sounds, like an unknown foreign tongue, not to be understood without interpretation (14: 6-13).

4. The gift of interpretation is distinct from the gift of tongues, and it may be granted to the same individual who has the gift of tongues or to another (14: 13, 27, 28).

5. It is an energizing by the spirit, and is independent of the intellect of man (14: 14).

6. It is a thanksgiving and a blessing addressed to God (14: 16, 17).

7. It is a sign to the unbelieving (14: 22).

8. A number of people speaking with tongues at one and the same time will seem to the unbeliever to be maniacs (14: 23).

Chrysostom said of this whole section of the First Epistle that it was exceedingly obscure. Chrysostom had never seen any instance of this charism, and he felt himself very much in the dark concerning it. We know more about psychology than Chrysostom did, and we have seen the gift of tongues in our own community. We think, therefore, that these chapters are not so obscure to us as they were to him.

We gather from the facts mentioned above that the gift of tongues at Corinth was not the gift of the knowledge or use of any foreign languages, and that it was not exercised for any missionary or

apologetic or polemic or expository or preaching purposes. It was used in prayer and song and thanksgiving, not in continuous or logical discourse, but in ecstatic ejaculation. It was an individual experience and a method of personal worship and adoration. It was a spiritual rhapsody of vocal expression in terms unintelligible to both speaker and hearer, and in it the mind of the subject was inactive and the conscience of the spectator and auditor was unmoved. An unbeliever might be struck with the strangeness of the phenomenon, and he might conceive it to be an evidence of a divine possession; and in that sense it might be a sign to him and lead to his conversion.

We must remember that here in Corinth it was a common belief that the heathen priests and priestesses and oracles were inspired only when in ecstatic states, and that their very frenzies were regarded as a proof of their divine pos-

session. We read in Plato's Timæus, "God has given the art of divination to the foolishness of man. For no man, when in his senses, attains prophetic truth and inspiration; but when he receives the inspired word either his intelligence is enthralled by sleep or he is demented by some distemper or possession."[1] In the Ion Socrates classes the poets with the diviners and prophets, and declares that their inspiration is attained in the same way. "The poet is a light and winged and holy thing, and there is no invention in him until he has been inspired and is out of his senses, and the mind is no longer in him: when he has not attained to this state, he is powerless and is unable to utter his oracles. . . . God takes away the mind of poets and uses them as His ministers, as He also uses diviners and holy prophets, in order that we who hear them may know that

[1] "The Dialogues of Plato" (Jowett's Translation), Vol. II, p. 563.

they speak not of themselves who utter these priceless words in a state of unconsciousness, but that God is the speaker, and that through them He is conversing with us."[2]

This was the current conception of the method and evidence of inspiration in Corinth. It was not strange, therefore, that in the Christian Church there should be those who felt themselves filled and thrilled with a spiritual exaltation which they were sure was divine in its origin, and which they naturally expected to evidence itself in the same ecstatic ejaculations they had seen in the heathen worshipers in their similar state. Paul had founded Churches in other Greek communities and throughout the Gentile world; but in no other of the Pauline Churches have we any record of the occurrence of this phenomenon. It was a very congenial atmosphere for its exercise in Corinth, and it may not have

[2] Op. cit., Vol. I, p. 224.

appeared among the Pauline converts in any other place.[3] However, speaking with tongues is mentioned in other portions of the New Testament, and it may be well now to look at these passages.

[3] We note that Paul came in contact with this phenomenon at Ephesus (Acts 19: 1-6), mentioned in the further discussion.

Chapter II

OTHER NEW TESTAMENT PASSAGES

These are five in number:

1. In Mark 16: 17 we read that certain signs shall accompany them that believe, and among these signs shall be this, "They shall speak with new tongues." Concerning this passage we need to say only three things:

(1). Some of the most ancient texts, such as C, L, and Δ, omit the word "new," and its genuineness therefore becomes doubtful. It is omitted in the text of Westcott and Hort, and is noted as questionable in the margin of the Revised Versions.

(2). The whole of this appendix to the Gospel according to Mark, 16: 9-20, is of doubtful authenticity and is re-

garded by most authorities as belonging to the sub-apostolic age.

(3). Nothing definite is told us here concerning the nature of the phenomenon beyond the mere mention of it as a sign. For these reasons we leave this passage and turn to others of better-attested authenticity and more definite information.

2. In Acts 19: 1-6 we read that Paul came to Ephesus and found certain disciples of John the Baptist there whom he persuaded to become Christians. They were baptized, "and when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Spirit came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied."

3. In Acts 10: 46 we are told that after Peter had preached to the household of Cornelius the Holy Spirit fell on all them that heard the word, and the Jewish spectators were amazed, "for they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God."

Is there anything in these passages to indicate that the phenomenon at Ephesus or at Cæsarea was in any wise different from that at Corinth? We think not. At Ephesus the gift of tongues is accompanied with the gift of prophesying, and we remember that the whole of the fourteenth chapter of First Corinthians is given to a comparison between these two coincident gifts in the Corinthian Church. At Cæsarea we are told that those who spoke with tongues "magnified God," and at Corinth we saw that the tongues were used in blessing and thanking God. In the absence of anything that would clearly distinguish them in the accounts given, we conclude that they were practically the same phenomena in these three places.

4. Peter gave an account of his doings in Cæsarea before the brethren in Jerusalem, and in describing the experiences of the Gentiles he said, "As I began to speak, the Holy Spirit fell on them, just

as He fell upon us at the beginning" (Acts 11: 15); and again, "God gave unto them the like gift as He did also unto us, when we believed on the Lord Jesus Christ" (Acts 11: 17). We understand that Peter here is identifying the Pentecostal experience with the experience at Cæsarea. If, as we have concluded, the experience at Cæsarea was the same as that at Ephesus and at Corinth, and if it was also, as Peter suggests, exactly the same as that in Jerusalem at the first Christian Pentecost, then all the occurrences of this phenomenon in the New Testament have to do with one and the same thing; for the only other mention of the speaking with tongues is

5. In Acts 2: 4-12, where the one hundred and twenty were filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. We must give more particular attention to this passage.

Chapter III

THE PENTECOSTAL GIFT OF TONGUES

Did the phenomenon at Pentecost differ from that at Corinth, and what was the exact nature of it? We will endeavor to answer these questions, and in doing so we will examine some of the conclusions reached by various authorities.

1. The most absurd exegesis of this passage is that which regards the tongues of the Pentecostal experience as the literal tongues in the mouths of the disciples. Thayer says, "The plural in the phrase to speak with tongues, used even of a single person, refers to the various motions of the tongue."[1] Van Hengel thinks that the "other tongues" and the "new tongues" with which the disciples

[1] Thayer, "Lexicon of the New Testament," p. 118.

spoke were their own tongues, given other and new power by the baptism of the Holy Spirit. They had been tongues without fire, and now they were tongues of fire. Their new inspiration had made them new tongues. They were new men and new women, and they spoke with new language and with other tongues than they had known before this wonderful spiritual exaltation. They spoke in Aramaic and they used their own tongues, but their unwonted fluency and fervor, and possibly their adoption of new and strange phraseology, made their own tongues seem like other and new tongues to them.

The trouble with this suggestion is that the tongues of verse four are identified with languages in verses six and eight, and that the tongues spoken by the disciples are identified with the tongues and the languages spoken by the spectators in verses eight and eleven. These spectators had no tongues of fire and no

new inspiration. The new tongues of the disciples were old tongues to them. The tongues of verses eight and eleven were not physical tongues, but languages.

2. Ernesti, Bleek, and Baur have labored with great learning to show that "other tongues" may be interpreted to mean "strange words or archaic, poetic glosses." These glosses were not in use in ordinary language, but in this moment of extraordinary experience they seemed to flow naturally to the lips, and being taken from many different dialects and languages they were in reality other and new tongues to those who found themselves using them. The objection to this suggestion is that it gives a technical and grammatical meaning to the word "tongue"—a meaning which is not to be found anywhere else in the Old or the New Testament, and which Luke would not be at all likely to use in this connection, and which the Parthians and Medes and Elamites surely could not

have used in any case. If all of these foreigners not only heard the disciples speaking in their own native tongues, but also discovered that they were using archaic and obsolete expressions in those tongues, we have a miracle unnecessarily heightened. To tell the wonderful works of God in foreign languages would surely be sufficient, without telling them in antiquated and strange and stilted phraseology. One would think that the preaching would have been more effective in the common speech.

3. Herder thought that the Pentecostal tongues were simply new interpretations of the ancient prophets, new expositions of the Scriptures. The old preachers of righteousness seemed to be speaking again through the lips of these men, and the Pentecostal inspiration gave to the old writings new life. The apostles preached with new and strange power, and the ancient oracles were transformed in their speech. To this

we object again that the text demands that the tongues be interpreted to mean languages and not expositions.

4. Gregory of Nazianzus suggested the possibility that the miracle at Pentecost was a miracle of hearing rather than a miracle of speaking. The disciples spoke in one tongue, but their hearers, in their excitement, either imagined or were sure that they had listened to the wonderful works of God narrated in their native speech. Gregory decided against this hypothesis, but it has been adopted by the Venerable Bede, Erasmus, Schneckenburger, Svenson, and others. In the twelfth century Saint Bernard preached the second crusade to the Germans in Latin, and his commanding presence and sweeping eloquence made a greater impression upon his audiences than his speeches ever did after they were translated into the German tongue. The Germans were moved by them, as if in their own tongues they were hearing

these wonderful appeals. Could it be that the auditors at Pentecost had a similar experience?

Saint Vincent Ferrer died in 1419. Of him we read, "Spondanus and many others say the saint was honored with the gift of tongues, and that, preaching *in his own*, he was understood by men of different languages; which is also affirmed by Lanzano, who says that Greeks, Germans, Sardes, Hungarians, and people of other nations declared they understood every word he spoke, though he preached in Latin, or in his mother-tongue, as spoken at Valentia."[2] The same marvel is related of Saint Anthony of Padua and Saint Francis Xavier. Such a miracle is possible; but Beza long ago suggested that Luke had not made use of that perspicuity and integrity of language which the Holy Spirit would sanction if this was what he intended to say. The language he

[2] Alban Butler, "Lives of the Saints," sub April 5.

uses would lead us to conclude that the wonder was in the speaking and not in the hearing upon this occasion.

5. Origen, Gregory of Nazianzus, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Augustine, Jerome, and most of the Church fathers believed that the disciples at Pentecost were miraculously and permanently endowed with the power of using foreign languages in their missionary work. Chrysostom thought that each of the disciples was given the knowledge of one particular language—the one he would need for evangelistic work in his future field of missionary activity. Augustine, however, says, "Every one of them spoke in the tongues of *all* nations; thus signifying that the unity of the catholic Church would embrace all nations, and would in like manner speak in all tongues."[3]

Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory of Nazianzus connect the Pentecostal gift

[3] "De Civ. Dei.," XVIII, Chap. 49.

of tongues, by way of contrast, with the confusion of tongues at Babel. The latter said: "As the old confusion of tongues was laudable, when men who were of one language in wickedness and impiety, even as some now venture to be, were building the Tower; for by the confusion of their language the unity of their intention was broken up, and their undertaking destroyed; so much more worthy of praise is the present miraculous one. For being poured from One Spirit upon many men, it brings them again into harmony."[4] Grotius says, "The confusion of tongues scattered men; the gift of tongues gathers the scattered peoples into one." Schelling calls the Pentecostal miracle "Babel reversed." It has been a favorite thought among theologians and religious writers everywhere.

It is sufficient to say, by way of dis-

[4] Orat. XLI, 16, "Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers," Vol. VII, p. 384.

sent, that there is no hint of this contrast in the New Testament, and surely none in the narrative here. The endowment with foreign languages at this time, though generally believed in by the Church fathers and many of the older expositors, has been abandoned by modern authorities. Dean Alford and Bishop Wordsworth are almost alone in maintaining it. Meyer says, "The sudden communication of a facility of speaking foreign languages is neither logically possible nor psychologically and morally conceivable."[5] This may be a rather sweeping judgment, but many reasons may be given for rejecting the theory on less radical but equally cogent grounds.

(1). Those who heard these tongues are said to have been "Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Judea and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, in Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and the parts of

[5] "Commentary on Acts," p. 48.

Libya about Cyrene, and sojourners from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabians." It is noticeable that this is a list of countries and not of languages. If the crowd consisted of Jews and proselytes come up from these various countries to the Pentecostal feast, they would not represent a great variety of language. Possibly the Greek would be understood by all of them. Surely the Greek and the Aramaic would suffice to represent the tongues spoken by all. The conquests of Alexander had spread the Greek tongue throughout the whole extent of the Roman Empire. The Judean and Arabian Jews spoke the West Aramaic; and the Babylonian Jews spoke the East Aramaic. There were dialectical differences, of course; but they could all have been reached with one language, or, at most, two. To have endowed the disciples with the power of speaking all languages at this time would have been superfluous and unnecessary, and our

God is not given to the working of unnecessary miracles. It was not only unnecessary at that time and place, but it was unnecessary in any of the later ministry of the disciples recorded in our Scriptures. In all the lands to which the gospel spread in that generation, as far as we have the record of it, the use of Aramaic, Greek, and Latin would have met their needs. We object to this theory of the gift of tongues, first, because it entails belief in what the Germans call a *Luxus-Wunder*—a superfluous and unnecessary miracle.

(2). The speaking with tongues began before the crowd came together. What reason could there have been for the speaking in foreign languages when there was no one present to hear them or to understand?

(3). Peter, in the Pentecostal sermon which followed, makes no reference to any extraordinary endowment with foreign tongues. He does say that this

phenomenon is the fulfillment of a prophecy by Joel, but in that prophecy we find nothing about such an endowment.

(4). The whole suggestion rests upon the fallacious supposition that the gift of tongues was a preparation for the evangelization of the foreign nations. The New Testament makes no such statement concerning it. At Corinth, as we have seen, the tongues were used in individual worship and adoration, and the gospel was not preached to anybody by means of them. Does any one suppose that the disciples of the Baptist at Ephesus or Cornelius and his household at Cæsarea, upon whom the gift of tongues came just as it did upon the one hundred and twenty at Pentecost, were thereby commissioned and empowered to become missionaries to the foreign nations? There is no hint of any such thing in the narrative.

Then, when we look more closely at the narrative here in the second chapter

of the Book of Acts, we find that those with the gift of tongues simply declared the wonderful works of God. They did not preach. Peter did the preaching afterward, and in one tongue which was understood by all the people. *The glossolalia here was in all probability just what it was at Corinth—a succession of ecstatic ejaculations from souls overflowing with praise and adoration to God for all His wonderful works and especial personal blessings.*

The effect produced upon the beholders is evidently the same here as at Corinth. Some are impressed and others are mocking. Here the latter said that these men were filled with new wine. At Corinth they declared the men speaking with tongues were insane. A drunken man and an insane man are alike in their maudlin speech. There was something about this manifestation both at Pentecost and at Corinth that led to these accusations. We think that it was the fact that the

speech was incoherent and ejaculatory throughout. There may have been an occasional word or phrase that was understood, but for the most part it was a strange and bewildering jargon, more like the gibbering of a maniac or the maundering of a drunken man than anything else these auditors had known in their experience. *An orderly discourse in a foreign tongue, understood by many who were present, would never have given any occasion for such criticism. Drunken men and maniacs never have been granted any extraordinary endowment of the knowledge and use of foreign tongues.*

(5). Paul spoke with tongues more than they all, but we have no record of the fact that he knew any more foreign languages than he had acquired by the regular method of practice and study. Indeed, in the narrative in the fourteenth chapter of Acts of the ministry at Lystra it is apparent that neither Paul nor Barnabas knew the native speech of

those among whom they were laboring. Paul worked a miracle of healing, and the people said in the speech of Lycaonia, "The gods have come down to us in the likeness of men," and they called Barnabas Zeus and Paul Hermes. Why did not Barnabas and Paul renounce these titles and remonstrate with the multitude that they could not suffer any adoration of themselves? Evidently because they had not understood, and they did not know what was going on. It was only when the priest of the idol temple came with oxen and garlands to offer sacrifices to them that Barnabas and Paul began to understand what all of this meant, and then they rent their garments and sprang forth, saying, "We also are men of like passions with you" (Acts 14: 8-15). It was rather late in the day to do that, if they had understood from the beginning what the people were saying and planning. Evidently they had not understood. Their adequate excuse was

that in the very first moment that the procedure of the people, not their speech, had made their designs manifest, they hastened to repudiate all idolatrous worship directed to themselves. If they had known the speech they would have put a stop to these things long before.

(6). Very early and seemingly reliable Church tradition tells us that Mark accompanied Peter as his interpreter. If the gift of tongues Peter had received at Pentecost had given him the power to speak in foreign languages, he would not have needed any interpreter.

(7). All of the Early Church literature is in one tongue—the Greek. Epistles written at Jerusalem are written in Greek. The Epistle to the Hebrews is written in Greek. The Epistle to the Romans is written in Greek. The Epistle to the Gauls is written in Greek. Surely, if the apostles were all gifted with the fluent use of foreign tongues, some of the writing of the first two centuries

would have appeared in some one of these other tongues. Since Greek was sufficient for all of the writing, it could have sufficed for all of the preaching, too.

(8). The Greek of the New Testament is not the purest Greek of the age. The writers of the various books differ largely among themselves in their command of the Greek vocabulary and grammar. Some indulge in provincialisms and barbarisms. If their knowledge of Greek had been given them by supernatural endowment, we surely might expect their Greek to be correct Greek. That it is not so in all cases goes to prove that it is not miraculous in its origin. The Greek of the New Testament bears every evidence that it has been acquired by human effort, and that it is subject to all the defects of a tongue used by those who have not been masters of it from earliest life.

(9). The New Testament has no trace of the use of tongues miraculously ob-

tained in the missionary work after Pentecost, and none of the missionary work in the later ages of Church history has been carried on by such means.

(10). It is contrary to all precedent and to all our knowledge of the ways of God with men to believe that He would give men any command of languages by miraculous means when they could be acquired by the use of faculties and opportunities already at hand. Our God has never put any premium upon laziness. He does not grant scientific or practical knowledge in answer to prayer or in independence of all personal labor. Spiritual gifts are bestowed out of hand. Knowledge of sciences and languages comes as the result of individual effort to obtain them.

6. Olshausen, Baumgarten, Thiersch, Lechler, Hackett, Gloag, Plumptre, and Schaff do not believe in the permanent endowment with the knowledge of foreign tongues at this time, but they do believe

that a temporary supernatural endowment of this sort was enjoyed by the disciples on the day of Pentecost, and that it passed away with the visible tongues of flame. We are ready to agree that the Pentecostal experience was an altogether unique and extraordinary one, and that at that creative moment any exceptional miracle might be natural enough. We believe such a wonder to be possible with God and with man. We have no objection to its extraordinary features. It is simply a question of New Testament exegesis and of the experience of Church history with us. We believe that the narrative in the second chapter of the Book of Acts must be interpreted to mean that those from distant lands and acquainted with other and foreign tongues heard the disciples speaking in those tongues ejaculations of praise and adoration which they recognized as belonging to their own speech, and not to the native tongue of these Galileans.

However, this seems to us to fall far short of even a temporary endowment of the mastery of these several tongues. Such a miracle would be even greater than a permanent endowment, and would be unnecessary and unparalleled. We are inclined to think that the experience at Pentecost was essentially like that at Cæsarea and at Ephesus and at Corinth, and that it has been reproduced more than once in later history. It might have been unique, but we see no compelling reason to believe it so.

7. There is a drastic method of procedure with the whole narrative of the gift of tongues at Pentecost which we may as well mention before giving our own conclusions in the matter. Radical critics avoid all further trouble with this phenomenon by saying that the account by Luke is unhistorical. Schmiedel, in his article in the Encyclopedia Biblica, may serve as a good example of these. He says, "The student who is not pre-

pared to give up the genuineness of the principal Pauline epistles is in duty stringently bound to consider the account of Paul as the primary one, and discuss it without even a side glance at Acts, and to reject as unhistorical everything in Acts which does not agree with this account."[6] Schmiedel very definitely does this. We hope to show that there may be no essential difference between Paul and Luke in their accounts of the gift of tongues, and that, therefore, it is not at all necessary to throw aside either one of them.

Zeller, in his work on the Acts of the Apostles, after a long discussion of the subject, comes to the following conclusion: "For our immediate object we restrict ourselves to the question from which we started—whether, as far as the existing indications can be followed, the narrative before us was based on any definite fact. After what has been

[6] Encyclopedia Biblica, Vol. IV, Col. 4761.

said, we can only reply in the negative. The demonstrably unhistorical elements of this narrative, as we have seen, concern not only its outworks or single subordinate features, but its real nucleus and focus; nay, the entire groundwork on which it moves is highly uncertain, and, according to all appearance, there seems to be no scope for any fact which could serve to explain it. Neither do we require any such fact to render its origin credible, as it is in all respects perfectly explicable by dogmatic motives and typical points of view."[7] Meyer, having dogmatically decided that the miracle is "neither logically possible nor psychologically and morally conceivable," must come to the conclusion that "the event, as Luke narrates it, can not be presented in the actual form of its historical occurrence."[8]

Professor Ramsay says: "In Acts

[7] Zeller, "The Acts of the Apostles," Vol. I, p. 206.

[8] *Op. cit.*, p. 48.

2:5-11 another popular tale seems to obtrude itself. In these verses the power of speaking with tongues . . . is taken in the sense of speaking in many languages. Here again we observe the distorting influence of popular fancy."[9]

Doctor Bartlet says that "the original facts of Pentecost were quite akin to the known analogies of glossolalia, but gradually took on another and more unique color in the tradition as it reached the author of Acts. In the course of tradition the idea would arise that the Divine voice, speaking through these inspired tongues, assumed the forms of the languages of mankind."[10] These all amount to the same thing. The account by Luke is not to be trusted. It rests upon baseless tradition or popular fancy or dogmatic motives. It is not historically accurate, and therefore may be summarily set aside.

[9] Ramsay, "St. Paul the Traveller," p. 370.

[10] The New Century Bible "Acts of the Apostles," Note C, p. 385.

We are not ready to agree with this conclusion. The day of Pentecost was the great and notable day of the founding of the Christian Church. The incidents of that day were among the most important which Luke had to record in this second volume of his historical work. If he can not be trusted in his account of these things, I, for one, see no reason for trusting him anywhere. Ramsay has shown in passage after passage that Luke was absolutely accurate in his statement of facts. Yet at this point he thinks that Luke was dependent upon popular fancy! *Surely Luke was less likely to go astray in his history of this most remarkable event he has to record than in any of the minor details of his book, which Ramsay has labored so long and so hard to substantiate.* He was the companion of Paul, who "spoke with tongues more than they all." He doubtless had seen the glossolalia at Corinth, or if he had not seen it he had heard all

about it from Paul. He knew what this phenomenon was like. He wrote this account when scores of those who were present at Pentecost were still living. Any inaccuracy in his statement would have been challenged at once.

A careful historian, such as Ramsay has proven Luke to be, would not be mistaken in his narrative of one of the most important events, if not the most important event, in his book. To maintain this destructive position of the critics with any plausibility at all, Luke's authorship of the Book of Acts must be given up and the composition of the book must be carried down into the second century, when all eye-witnesses were dead and popular fancies had had time to supplant and replace the knowledge of actual facts. We can not find any good reason for such radical conclusions. On the other hand, we are assured of Luke's authorship, and that carries with it an assurance of Luke's

accuracy. We are ready to accept the narrative of the gift of tongues at Pentecost as a truthful and historical one, and then we are ready to interpret it as well as we may *in accordance with the same gift in other places and in later Church history.*

8. The glossolalia at Pentecost was essentially that experienced at Corinth and Ephesus and Cæsarea, and it has been repeated again and again in Church history. Its one remarkable feature seems to have been the use of words and phrases in foreign tongues. We do not believe that this is an altogether peculiar feature. Probably at Corinth it was in the midst of the ecstatic ejaculations of the glossolalia that some had been heard to say, "Jesus anathema!" and Paul writes in the First Epistle, "I make known unto you, that no man speaking in the Spirit of God saith, Jesus is anathema" (1 Cor. 12: 3). That phrase, *Jesus anathema*, would be a foreign phrase

at Corinth; and we can readily believe that some one in the ecstatic condition of the glossolalia had been heard to repeat this phrase again and again.

At Los Angeles not long ago a woman had the gift of tongues, and a reputable Chinaman who heard her said that she was speaking his dialect of Chinese. When he was asked to interpret what she had said, he refused to do it, saying that the language was the vilest of the vile.[11] How did this Christian woman in a religious service happen to have such words upon her lips? She did not understand them. She did not know what she was saying. She was not conscious that she was speaking in Chinese. What was the explanation? Doubtless in Los Angeles she had heard these words and phrases from some Chinese—the cook in her own kitchen, it may be, or the laundryman, or the coolies in the orchard or upon the street. She had not under-

[11] Schofield, "Christian Sanity," p. 97.

stood them. She had not consciously remembered them. But in the exalted and ecstatic state these words and phrases came out of her subconscious memory and ran from her tongue along with other ecstatic ejaculations equally unintelligible to her.

That would explain what had happened at Corinth. No Christian in his conscious and intelligent speech would say that Jesus was anathema or accursed. In the glossolalia some had been heard to say it. They had heard the phrase on the streets of Corinth. There were many blasphemers there, and any forcible phrase uttered in passing would remain in the memory and be apt to reappear in their ecstatic condition. Paul repudiated all suggestion of responsibility on the part of the Spirit of God for such expressions, even if they occurred with other pious ones in the speech of the people who were speaking with tongues. The devil might take advantage of one

in that experience and make use of the tongue, over which the understanding had no control, just as easily as the Spirit of God. By their utterances let them be judged; and if no one could interpret their utterances, then by their results upon the individual experience and life.

Now, it is along this line that I would find the explanation of the experience at Pentecost; only it was graciously granted that in that first glossolalia nothing was said that would mar the harmony of the speech with the spiritual possession and religious exaltation enjoyed by all. The reason for this is easily apparent, too. The Jews and Proselytes were gathered from the many lands to worship their God in Jerusalem. On all the streets at this feast, and on many other previous ones, the Galilean disciples had heard their pious ejaculations. They had not noted them at the time. They could not have repeated them at any time, if they

had been asked to do so. They were simply foreign tongues to them, but spoken by pious people and at the time of the great national religious celebration—phrases and sentences of praise and prayer setting forth the wonderful works of God. At Pentecost there was a most extraordinary spiritual baptism. It swept the hundred and twenty into an ecstatic condition. Their tongues were loosened and they had fluency of expression for all of their spiritual joy; but, to the amazement of all who heard, they were not speaking in their Galilean dialect, but they were pouring forth a flood of strange and unintelligible sounds.

It was a new speech for a new experience, ushering in the new time. Some mocked and said that they were drunken. Others listened more carefully, and, to their still greater astonishment, they heard now and then words and phrases these Galileans had never used in their own speech before—words and phrases

which they recognized as belonging to their foreign tongues, ejaculations of adoration and praise which belonged to languages spoken in the Far East or the North or the South or the West. Parthians, Medes, Elamites, the dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Phrygia, in Egypt, sojourners from Rome, Cretans, and Arabians all heard them speaking in their own languages in which they were born the mighty works of God. It was something new in Jewish history. One who witnessed it never would have forgotten it. They were not psychologists. They would not have looked for any scientific explanation of this phenomenon. They listened and heard that all the words and phrases and sentences which they could understand were religious in character and spoken to the praise of God; and they said, "It is the Spirit who gives them utterance." They were right. This was a spiritual exaltation, given after days of prayer. The new gift of

tongues was to those disciples a method of spiritual expression, a charism accompanying the other manifestations of the Spirit's presence and power.

With this understanding of the phenomenon, I see no reason why it may not have been *possible and probable and actual.* There was no endowment with the permanent knowledge of all or of any foreign languages. There was no temporary endowment with the knowledge of those languages as a whole. Under the stress of their great spiritual emotion the disciples were lifted out of their ordinary selves, and in their ecstasy they spoke with tongues, and in the flow of their expression there came up from the depths of their memories the phrases and sentences they had heard from the Jews and proselytes assembled in Jerusalem—unintelligible to them, and uttered unconsciously now, but all in the expression of their own spiritual state. They had lost the normal control of their

tongues and their memories were abnormally quickened, and the result for this brief period of ecstatic utterance was that narrated by Luke.

Luke does not say that the most of this speaking with tongues was in the same unintelligible jargon heard at Corinth and Ephesus and Cæsarea. He did not need to say it. Everybody in the Early Church knew the usual features of this phenomenon. Luke naturally enough fastens upon the one thing that marked the Pentecostal experience as especially noteworthy, namely, the occurrence in the flow of the glossolalia of expressions in all the foreign languages represented in the company at the Jerusalem feast, expressions which could be understood by various hearers and which were of such a character as to convince these hearers that the whole experience was indeed a manifestation from the Spirit of God. That it was not of man would be apparent to them in the fact that when

the disciples had recovered from their ecstasy, and had returned to their normal condition, they could neither remember nor repeat the foreign languages they had so fluently used a few moments before. *The foreign languages spoken at Pentecost are explicable to us as due to abnormally quickened memories, reproducing to these Jews and proselytes phrases and sentences heard from them, and all-unconsciously stored in minds that had no use of them in normal conditions. The gift of tongues is explicable here as everywhere else, as one form of ecstatic expression, possible at any time of great spiritual uplift, and repeated again and again in the history of the Church.*

That the possibility of this rational explanation of the psychological phenomenon at Pentecost may be more clear, we quote from Noah Porter's "Elements of Intellectual Science." He says: "It is questioned by many whether absolute forgetfulness is possible — whether, at

least, we are authorized to affirm that the soul can lose beyond recovery anything which it has known. It is certain that knowledge which has remained out of sight for a long period has often been suddenly recovered. Even acquisitions which were the least likely to be remembered, and which, previously, were never known or suspected to have been made, come up as though the soul were inspired to receive strange revelations of its capacities and acquirements."[12] The disciples may have overheard these foreign phrases and sentences without having paid any especial attention to them and without being aware that they had been retained in memory. Indeed, they might have been assured that they had not been so retained, since they found themselves utterly unable to repeat them afterward. Yet it would have been perfectly possible for them to have used them fluently when under the

[12] Porter, "Elements of Intellectual Science," p. 264.

excitement and the exaltation of Pentecost.

Porter goes on to instance the well-known story told by Samuel Taylor Coleridge in his "Biographia Literaria" of the servant-girl who could neither read nor write, but when seized with a nervous fever, in her delirium talked continuously in Latin and Greek and Hebrew in pompous tones and with most distinct enunciation. Sheets of her ravings were taken down from her mouth, and she was found to be reciting long passages from classical and rabbinical writers. All who heard her were astonished, and many were disposed to believe that she was possessed by a good or an evil spirit. Inquiries were made into the history of her life, and it was learned that, several years before, she had been a servant in the family of an old and learned Protestant pastor in the country, and that pastor had been in the habit of walking up and down a passage of the house

adjoining the kitchen and reading aloud to himself favorite portions from the very volumes from which the delirious girl was found to be quoting. She had heard them through the partition. They were utterly unintelligible to her, but these strange sounds had all-unconsciously impressed themselves upon her memory, and in the mental and nervous excitement of her delirium she was able so strangely to recall them and utter them. Under extraordinary mental stimulus such lingual recollections and reproductions are possible. "Rev. Timothy Flint, in his 'Recollections,' records of himself that, when prostrated by malarial fever, he repeated aloud long passages from Virgil and Homer which he had never formally committed to memory, and of which, both before and after his illness, he could repeat scarcely a line."[13] There was no fever at Pentecost, but there was abnormal mental and nervous

[13] Porter, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

exaltation. These illustrations are taken from the older psychology, but now that the new researches into the unsuspected reserves of power in the depths of the subliminal consciousness have come into vogue, all we have suggested at this point is only reinforced and established.

This, then, is our understanding of the phenomenon at Pentecost. There was a real speaking of foreign languages there. That was not the whole of the gift of tongues, and we are not disposed to think that it played any considerable part in the total phenomenon. The phrases and sentences from the foreign languages were in all probability *only the flotsam and jetsam on the general current of speech.* They came to the surface occasionally, and they were doubtless repeated again and again. The most of the speaking was unintelligible, and Luke has passed it by in his account, for it was just like the glossolalia with which

the Early Church had become acquainted in other places. But these foreign phrases, spoken by Galileans who were not linguists and clearly understood by the foreigners of many nations, were the remarkable feature of the phenomenon at Pentecost; and it is this remarkable feature which Luke has taken care to record. These foreign sentences were not natural to the Galilean disciples and were not remembered by them afterward. The use of them is explicable by the powers proven to belong to the subliminal consciousness and the abnormally-quickened memory. All the phrases they repeated they must have heard before at some time or another, though they themselves may not have been conscious of that fact. The same phenomenon is frequent in later Church history, and is common enough to-day.[14]

[14] For a somewhat similar conclusion, see "The American Journal of Theology," Vol. XIII, p. 206.

THE GIFT OF TONGUES

We turn now to an enumeration of some of the periods and places in Church history in which the gift of tongues has been manifest. There have been many of them, and we simply make a choice among the instances which are best known.

Chapter IV

LATER INSTANCES OF THE GIFT OF TONGUES

1. The Montanists represented a reaction in the Church against the growing ecclesiasticism and the dependence upon forms instead of the spiritual power of the primitive times. It was a protest against the domination of a hierarchy in favor of individual liberty and personal inspiration which the Montanists preached, and they strove to come into direct communion with the divine. Great revivals marked their efforts in the East and the West. In these revivals trances, prophecies, and tongues were frequent phenomena. It may have been with some reference to these that Irenæus says that certain men in his day spoke with all kinds of tongues. At the close

of the second century the gift of tongues was still in the possession of the Church. Montanism was crushed out by the ecclesiastical authorities, and not until Martin Luther's time did Protestantism become again a serious menace to the integrity of the organized Church.

2. In 1685 the revocation of the Edict of Nantes took place, and a rigorous persecution of the Huguenots began at once. Churches were destroyed, ministers were banished, meetings were forbidden, schools were suppressed, Bibles and religious books were burned, men were tortured and hung or sent to the prisons or the galleys for life, and women suffered worse than death. It was at this time that the Church of the Desert came into being. The Camisards or peasants of the Cevennes organized military forces. Cavalier, the baker's boy, only seventeen years old, defeated the Count de Broglie and three of the marshals of France, and the Protestants

finally forced an honorable peace. They were granted liberty of conscience and the right of assembly, the liberation of their friends in the prisons and the galleys, and the restitution of their property and civil rights. There never had been a more desperate situation. There never was a more glorious deliverance.

During all this period of distress and warfare the Camisards lived in the constant experience of the supernatural. They had visions and trances and inspired prophecies. The discipline of the army was maintained by a prophetess. Supernatural lights guided them to places of safety, divine voices sang encouragement to them. They went without food for nine days at a time without feeling the worse for it, shots and wounds did no harm to them; and, though they shed tears of blood, they were assured of divine protection and aid, and they lived in constant communion with God.

It was among these people, during a

period of thirteen years, from 1688 to 1701, that a new form of the speaking with tongues arose. It appeared only at intervals, but hundreds of people were affected by it.[1] "Children three years old and upwards preached sermons in correct French, which they could not ordinarily use, with appropriate emphasis and gestures impossible to a child. Some of the sermons were three-quarters of an hour long. The prophets 'first swooned and appeared without any feeling, then broke out into exhortations—fervent, eloquent, correct, well-chosen, appropriate, mostly in good French.' There was nothing hysterical or wildly excited about their manner, only they were insensible to pain and could not be induced to stop. 'The boldness of the young boy astonished me,' writes an eye-witness. 'It was, indeed, a marvel to see an ignorant and timid child undertake

[1] Cutten, "The Psychological Phenomena of Christianity," p. 56, puts the number at six hundred.

to teach the people, to preach in a language he was incapable of speaking at another time, expressing himself magnificently, and presiding like a bishop in an assembly of Christians.'"[2]

Others besides the children had the same experience, speaking in the good French of the Huguenot Bible while in their ecstasy, and falling back into their own Romance idiom when they had recovered. They then had no recollection of what they had said in the trance condition, and they had no power to converse in anything else than their native patois. This marvel is of the same character as that at Pentecost. It has been explained as the result of abnormally excited memories in time of special stress and appalling persecutions. The children and others were simply recalling sermons they had heard from their pastors in previous years. One writer even goes so far as to suggest that they were

[2] Wright, "Some New Testament Problems," p. 293.

remembering sermons heard by their grandparents long before they were born. It was an inherited memory at work! "If we are unable to conceive memory working at such a pitch," he says, "it is because our imagination, not being adequately sustained by knowledge, is unequal to conceive the degree to which this sacred lore has been burnt into the soul of a long-suffering people."[3] It is remarkable that over in Silesia at about the same time a sweeping revival was affecting boys and girls almost exclusively, and they are said to have prayed and preached with extraordinary power. The Cevennes phenomena became known through all Europe. Refugees came to London, where John Lacy became a leader among them. Sir Richard Bulkley, a wealthy baronet, was a convert, and he declared that he had heard Lacy repeat long sentences in Latin, and another had spoken Hebrew, though when

[3] Richard Heath, in the *Contemporary Review*, Jan., 1886.

they were not in the spiritual ecstasy they were utterly unable to use these tongues.

It is to the prophets of the Cevennes that John Wesley refers when he is answering Doctor Middleton's statement that, after the apostolic times, there is not in all history one instance, even so much as mentioned, of any particular person who pretended to exercise this gift. John Wesley answers: "Sir, your memory fails you again. It has undoubtedly been pretended to, and that at no great distance, either, from our time or country. It has been heard of more than once, no farther off than the valleys of Dauphiny. Nor is it yet fifty years ago since the Protestant inhabitants of those valleys so loudly pretended to this and other miraculous powers, as to give much disturbance to Paris itself. And how did the king of France confute that pretense, and prevent its being heard any more? Not by the pen of his

scholars, but by (a truly heathen way) the swords and bayonets of his dragoons."[4] We think that it was the sword and bayonet that caused them, rather than caused them to cease. When peace came these supposedly supernatural phenomena were no longer seen.

3. In 1822 Edward Irving came to London to preach in the Caledonian chapel. He was a young Scotchman over six feet tall and with a head that measured one foot in both dimensions. Carlyle said of him, "Bodily and spiritually, perhaps there was not, in that November, 1822, when he first arrived here, a man more full of genial, energetic life in all these islands." De Quincy declared of him: "He was unquestionably, by many degrees, the greatest orator of our times. Of him, indeed, more than of any man whom I have seen throughout my whole experience, it might be said, with truth and empha-

[4] Wesley's Works, Vol. V, p. 744.

sis, that he was a Boanerges, a son of thunder." Canning went to hear him, and afterward, in a discussion in Parliament, he told the House that he had gone to a chapel without any wealthy endowments and he had heard there an eloquence that surpassed anything in his experience. Thereafter people had to fight their way into Irving's chapel, and great crowds besieged its doors whenever he was expected to speak. A large church was built for him in Regent's Square, and for a time he was unquestionably the greatest preacher in London.

He was a man of most remarkable powers and of most remarkable piety. He was walking with his friend, Story, at Rosneath, and they came to a high-barred gate. Irving leaped it at a bound. "Dear me, Irving," said Story, "I did not think you had been so agile." Irving immediately replied, "Once I read you an essay of mine, and you said, 'Dear me, Irving, I did not think you

had been so classical.' Another time you heard me preach, 'Dear me, Irving, I did not know you had so much imagination.' Now, Story, you shall see what great things I will do yet."[5] He decided that he would endeavor to reach the cultured classes with the gospel, for those classes seemed most difficult to influence and were most neglected. He said of his fellow-clergymen, "They prepare for teaching gipsies, for teaching bargemen, for teaching miners by apprehending their way of conceiving and estimating truth; and why not prepare for teaching imaginative men and political men and scientific men who bear the world in hand?"[6] This was his especial call, and his success was astounding.

The fashionable world flocked to hear him. Irving dealt faithfully with them. He came to believe that they were living

[5] Henderson, "The Religious Controversies of Scotland," p. 114.

[6] Oliphant, "Life of Edward Irving," Vol. I, p. 167.

in the dawn of a new dispensation. He prayed and hoped for a higher type of Christianity than the world had yet known. He claimed that the Church of his day might have Pentecostal power and Pentecostal gifts and revelations. God had new light for the new times. He said, "Think you that Abraham took test of God by his dealings with Noah? or Moses by Abraham? or the Apostles at Pentecost by the schools of the prophets in Bethel or in Gilgal? If we have the Word of the Lord, we have the Word of the Lord and nothing else; and not thou or I, nay, not Paul nor Peter nor Moses, but He of whose fullness they all received."[7]

His daring genius plunged ahead of the common crowd. He lived in the presence of the Most High, and he believed in the immediate manifestation of the divine. He wrote to his wife: "O, Isabella, put nothing off; live quietly

[7] Oliphant, *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 333.

unto eternity. We know not what a day may bring forth. If you be languid, then cry for help; if you be under bondage, then cry for deliverance; and abide believing, abide believing; opening your heart to the admonitions of the Holy One—your ear to the admonitions of every faithful one. Turn aside from lies, from flattery, from vanity and folly. Be earnest, be grave—always ready. There will be no folly nor laughter nor bedimming the truth with false appearances nor masquerading in eternity."

It was in this spirit he himself lived. He was not a vain man. He refused the degree of D. D. from the University of Edinburgh, his Alma Mater, because he had not sat an examination for it. He declined to print a sermon which he had preached before royalty because he felt that the substance and the style of it were unworthy of preservation. He had no fear of man; he feared nothing but God and sin. He made earnest with his

religion, and at last his prayers were answered and the apostolic gifts began to appear in his Church. He tested them by every means he had to employ. He was satisfied of their genuineness, and gave them free play in his public congregations. At his trial by the Church courts he said: "I had sat at the head of the Church praying that these gifts might be poured out on the Church, believing in the Lord's faithfulness; and that I was praying the prayer of faith, and that He had poured out the gifts in answer to our prayers. Was I to disbelieve what in faith I had been praying for and which we had all been praying for? When it came I had every opportunity of proving it. I had put it to the proof according to the Word of God, and I found it, so far as I was able to discern, that it is the thing written in the Scriptures, and into the faith of which we had been baptized."[8] Having reached

[8] Oliphant, *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 432.

this conclusion, he refused to hinder what he considered to be the voice of the Holy Spirit in any of his meetings. He could not do otherwise and remain an honest man. There were visions and ecstasies and prophecies and speaking with tongues. Irving was tried and deposed from the ministry of the Presbyterian Church. He was ejected from his Church in 1832. Most of his fashionable hearers had fallen away, but great crowds followed him to Newman Street, where the gift of tongues had the right of way. Two years later Irving died of consumption, in the forty-second year of his age.

Carlyle, his boyhood friend, wrote of him: "Edward Irving's warfare has closed; if not in victory, yet in invincibility and faithful endurance to the end. . . . Here once more was a genuine man sent into this our *un*-genuine phantasmagoria of a world, which would go to ruin without such; here once

more was enacted the old tragedy, and has had its fifth act now, of *The Messenger of Truth in the Age of Shams.* . . . The Spirit of the Time, which could not enlist him as its soldier, must needs, in all ways, fight against him as its enemy: it has done its part, and he has done his. . . . One light shone on him always: alas, through a medium more and more turbid: the light from Heaven. His Bible was there, wherein must lie healing for all sorrows. To the Bible he more and more exclusively addressed himself. If it is the written Word of God, shall it not be the acted Word, too? Is it mere sound then; black printer's ink on white rag-paper? A half-man could have passed on without answering; a whole man must answer. Hence Prophecies of Millenniums, Gifts of Tongues—whereat Orthodoxy prims herself into decent wonder, and waves her Avaunt! Irving clave to his belief as to his soul's soul; followed it whithersoever, through

earth or air, it might lead him; toiling as never man toiled to spread it, to gain the world's ear for it—in vain. Ever wilder waxed the confusion without and within. The misguided noble-minded had now nothing left to do but die. He died the death of the true and brave. His last words, they say, were, 'In life and in death I am the Lord's.'—Amen! Amen! One who knew him well, and may with good cause love him, has said, 'But for Irving, I had never known what the communion of man with man means. His was the freest, brotherliest, bravest human soul mine ever came into contact with: I call him, on the whole, the best man I have ever, after trial enough, found in this world, or now hope to find.'"[9]

Six months after Irving's death the Catholic Apostolic Church was organized by his followers, and it has been a vigorous and growing Church ever since.

[9] Carlyle, "Essays," Vol. III, pp. 222-225.

It has established itself in England, Scotland, Canada, the United States, Prussia, France, Switzerland, Ireland, Belgium, Russia, Denmark, Sweden, Australia, and India. The gift of tongues is continually manifested in these Churches. Rossteuscher, in his book, "Der Aufbau der Kirche auf den ursprünglichen Grundlagen," describes it thus: "The speaking in a tongue lasts longer or shorter, five minutes at most. Sometimes it is only a few words, as it were the first outburst of the manifestation; it is, so to speak, the hidden source from which there comes afterwards, in the intelligible part of the discourse, the stream of life, fitted to water the Church. It is always a deeply felt kind of speech, which evidently fills the whole soul of the speaker. The discourse is accompanied sometimes with tears and groans, sometimes with cries of joy and even laughter. The speaking is regularly formed and markedly rhythmical. . . .

It is uttered with a force and a fullness of voice and often with a rapidity foreign to the person's ordinary mode of expression. They are accents which shake the soul and pierce the heart as prophecy itself can not do. The voice acquires a majesty found nowhere else. . . . One of the inspired said to Irving: 'When I am seized by the Spirit and lifted into the presence of God as one speaking with tongues, it is as if a covering were dropped over all that surrounds me, and as if I no longer saw anything except the goal of my aspiration and the way leading to it. . . . I feel myself shut in with God, hidden in His tent, secure from all the suggestions of the world, the flesh, and the devil.' . . . Another of the inspired thus described the spiritual contents of the state: 'The intimate perception of the presence of God in Christ, and of my own state in Jesus, with a torrent of joy which words can not describe. . . . In this state self-

consciousness blends with the consciousness of God without being lost in it. The inspired one is conscious of his own existence and of a power superior to his existence with the same clearness. This inward state remains the same during the intelligible and the unintelligible part of the discourse.'"[10]

A less sympathetic account of the external phenomena is given by Hohl, in a volume written in 1839: "Before the outburst of speech, it was noticeable that the person about to speak became profoundly self-absorbed, isolated from his surroundings; he shut his eyes and covered them with his hand. All at once, as if struck with an electric shock, he underwent a convulsion which shook his whole body. Then there escaped from his quivering mouth, as it were, a burning torrent of strange words, forcibly emphasized, and which, to my ear, re-

[10] Quoted in Godet, "Commentary on First Corinthians," Vol. II, pp. 286-287.

sembled most those of the Hebrew tongue. Every sentence was usually repeated three times, and given forth with incredible vigor and precision. To this first explosion of strange sounds, which were looked upon as the evidence of genuine inspiration, there succeeded each time, and with emphasis equally forcible, a longer or shorter address in English, which was also repeated several times sentence by sentence, or even word by word, and which consisted sometimes of serious exhortations or terrible warnings, sometimes of consolations full of unction. This latter part passed as the developed interpretation of the former, though it was not expressly given out as such by the speaker. After this manifestation the inspired person still remained for a time buried in profound silence, and only recovered slowly from this great expenditure of force."[11]

Philip Schaff heard the speaking with

[11] Quoted in Godet, *op. cit.*, p. 278.

tongues in a congregation in New York, and he describes it as follows: "The words were broken, ejaculatory, and unintelligible, but uttered in abnormal, startling, and impressive sounds, in a state of apparent unconsciousness and rapture, and without any control over the tongue, which was seized, as it were, by a foreign power."[12] It has been declared by some that fragments of known tongues—Spanish, Italian, Greek, and Hebrew—have been heard interspersed in the utterances of those under the power.

4. Similar experiences are said to have occurred among the Franciscans of the thirteenth century, and the Jansenists, and the early Quakers, and the Mormons, and the Lasäre or Readers of Sweden in 1841-3, and in the Irish revivals of 1859, and in the great Welsh revival of 1904. In the latter meetings young Welshmen and Welshwomen who

[12] Schaff, "History of the Christian Church," Vol. I, p. 237.

could not speak a dozen words in Welsh in ordinary conversation were remarkably and, as it seemed to them, supernaturally empowered to pray fervently and fluently for five and ten minutes in idiomatic Welsh. This enabling to speak in what was supposedly an unknown tongue was to many people the most remarkable feature of that remarkable revival.

5. A gift of tongues movement is at present attracting considerable attention around the world. I am told that it began among the Scandinavians through the meetings held by an Englishman—a Wesleyan local preacher who had been sent there to take charge of some mining operations. The Methodists were largely affected by it, but the movement was finally repudiated by the Methodist Church. The founder of the movement returned to England and held meetings in Wales—meetings which were said to have more evidence of spiritual power in

them than even those of the great revival. A wealthy man in India heard of them and wrote the leader that it had been revealed to him by the Spirit that the movement ought to be inaugurated in India, and he sent the passage money for the preacher to come. He went, and his experiences in Scandinavia and in Wales were repeated there. In the United States the power seems to have manifested itself first in Los Angeles, and it has spread rapidly eastward until now there are companies of the believers formed in most of the large cities of the United States and Canada.

In Chicago I had my first opportunity to see this phenomenon for myself. The leader of the movement was a Kentuckian and a Baptist. For five years he conducted a full gospel mission with average success. In 1906 his people began to exhibit these phenomena, and he followed them into the possession and the display of the same gifts. The mis-

sion has been "run along these lines" ever since, and it now has a dozen flourishing branches in the city. The most notable work seems to have been done among the Italians. Over a hundred of them were immersed in the baptistery of the central mission in the first winter. The mission hall was well-filled when we visited it. The faithful sit closely massed in the front half of the hall, and the visitors and unbelievers sit in the rear. All through the service, and here and there through the crowd, persons were affected with nervous paroxysms that made them shudder and writhe and sometimes occasioned contortions that must have been very painful to the subject, and one after another began to draw in the breath between the teeth in a hissing sound that suggested a serpent and the possession by evil spirits rather than good. Then the speaking with tongues would begin with ejaculations that appeared to bubble up

from the depths and burst forth from the lips with uncontrollable energy.

The most of the people affected were foreigners, and, if I could judge correctly from their appearance and accent, they were Norwegians and Swedes. The most of them were quite intelligent and respectable in outward seeming, and would have sat in any ordinary religious congregation without attracting attention by any peculiarity of feature or dress. There were some, however, who seemed fit candidates for an insane asylum, evidently with small mentality and on the edge of nervous wreck. All seemed to belong to the working class, and there was an unusual proportion of middle-aged and elderly, fleshy women who appeared to be matrons and housekeepers from humble homes, and who probably found the only excitement in their humdrum existence in these services.

A visiting brother from Winnipeg

"preached." He talked in the old-fashioned, high-keyed, sing-song style, with no consecutive thought. He told us that he did not know what he would say to us, but he would say whatever the Spirit would give him. The Spirit evidently gave him little or nothing to say concerning his text, and he fell to telling us of his own experience. He had received the gift of tongues in that room just one year ago that day, and he had taken the next train for Winnipeg, his home. There the Lord had kept him faithful and had greatly blessed him, and his home had become the center of the movement in the Northwest He told how the work had spread among the Indians, and some had come as far as two or three hundred miles to get a blessing "that the theological professors and doctors of divinity never had." He would talk for a few minutes in English and then run off suddenly into the speaking with tongues. The tongue was unin-

telligible gibberish to us. It might have been an Indian language; it seemed more like that than any of the more civilized tongues. It was smooth and fluent and somewhat musical. It seemed to us that the speaker resorted to the tongue when he could think of nothing else to say. It gave him time to collect himself and get a fresh start. In other meetings we have seen speakers seemingly exhaust their line of thought and then fall to leaping and shouting hallelujahs until the meeting warmed up a little and they had thought of something else to say.

The leader told us afterward that he himself had been told that he had spoken in good Hebrew and Norwegian when speaking with tongues, although he did not know those languages. The Chicago people do not believe that the speaking with tongues is given for missionary purposes. They do not have any hope that if they went to a foreign country the Lord would give them the

tongue of that country upon the moment of their arrival. He might and He might not. They feel sure that no such miracle is promised in the Word of God. In Los Angeles, in Pittsburgh, in Sweden, and other places it is reported that people bark like dogs and cackle like hens and make various sounds like birds and beasts in the meetings. We heard nothing but the hissing serpent sound in Chicago. Elsewhere we hear that there are frenzied huggings and kissings and rolling upon the floor, with which the civil authorities have sometimes had to interfere, as they verged so closely upon immoralities. We saw nothing of the sort in Chicago. One woman fell heavily like a log from her chair to the floor and lay there for hours in a trance, jerking occasionally and ejaculating at intervals, "Glory to Jesus, Jesus, Jesus, Jesus, Jesus!" and then relapsing into sleep or trance again. Little attention was paid to her, and everybody went away at the

close of the service and left her there on the floor with one old lady standing guard over her.

In the testimony meeting one sister told how she had seen a fiery serpent in mid-heaven in a vision. In the prayer service there was the singing in the Spirit, which was one of the features of the Irvingite movement in London. While one prayed, many were ejaculating and some were praying in tongues. The leader on the platform seemed to me to be the loudest among them, and he would frequently come out at the end of a sentence upon some emphatic tone which served as a keynote to the rest of them, and twenty or more would take their parts and begin to intone in harmony. It was more or less difficult to get the thing started, but when it once got to swinging it was a really remarkable exhibition of extemporized melody. It was a weird, unregulated chant, rising and falling, dying away and swelling out

again unexpectedly, as though some heavenly musician were playing upon his human instruments at his own free-will. Edward Irving has testified that this singing in the Spirit seemed to him to embody more than earthly music and suggest the archetypal melody of which all the Church's chants and hymns are but faint, poor echoes.[13] The Chicago leader explained to us afterward that these people never had had any instruction in music and that they knew nothing about the principles of harmony, and that it was only when they were in the Spirit that they could sing like that; and he further averred that the least intrusion of self would mean a discordant note in that music, so that it was clear to us that all who took part in that exercise were under obligation to keep in tune on penalty of the disclosure of an unsatisfactory spiritual state.

The present Tongues Movement is

[13] Oliphant, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 208.

likely to run its course in a few months or a few years, but its influence will be felt for another generation at least. These phenomena have occurred so frequently in the nineteenth century that it seems probable, at least, that we will hear of more and more of them in the century upon which we have entered. It may be that no great and sweeping revival will occur without more or less of their accompaniment. They will flourish most among the poorer and the illiterate classes, but they will by no means be confined to these. Past experience proves that educated and high-bred people are likewise influenced by them. It may be well, therefore, to inquire a little more closely as to their good and evil and the best attitude to assume toward them.

Chapter V

REASONS GIVEN IN FAVOR OF SPEAKING WITH TONGUES

1. "They are a sign and a manifestation to the unbeliever (1 Cor. 14:22). They attract his attention and may lead to his conversion." This is true. It is also true that many unbelievers are repelled by these phenomena. They think they are evidences of hysteria and insanity, and are therefore prejudiced against the Christianity which affects them and are made more difficult of approach through methods which seem to them saner. It might be difficult to determine whether more were helped or hindered by the strangeness of the gift of tongues. It may depend upon the community in which they appear. In the average Church community of Amer-

ica I think there is no doubt that they will do more harm than good among the unbelievers.

2. "They are an evidence to the believer that he is possessed fully by the Spirit of God. People may say and think that they are filled with the Holy Spirit, but when the Spirit takes possession of a man's organs of speech and uses them without his aid to praise God in strange tongues, the man has an assurance of the Holy Spirit's presence with him that others have not." It may be that the loss of self-control over the vocal organs, and the partial or complete loss of self-consciousness in the time of audible speech, is a valuable evidence to some people that they are specially gifted and more fully inspired than the rest of us. We give them joy of that conclusion, if it is helpful to them. We say only for ourselves that we have amply sufficient evidence of the Spirit's presence with us in the use of our own reason and of our

own tongue, and the abnegation of the use of these would not seem a blessing, but rather a hardship, to us. If the gift of tongues were a sign of the direct union of the individual soul with the Holy Spirit, we might recognize it as valuable in so far as it served that end; but we rejoice to believe that this direct communion may be maintained, and is maintained, by multitudes of people without this sign, and the sign is of infinitely less importance than the thing signified, and it is in no degree necessary to the assurance of direct communion with the Spirit of God.

3. "They tend to the edification of the individual believer." We can not dispute this, since the statement rests on individual conviction alone; and we have no desire to dispute it. It is evident, however, that the speaking in strange tongues does not edify a general congregation unless it be accompanied with an interpretation. Therefore, in

the interest of the general good, all speaking with tongues ought as far as possible to be banished from a public service if it does not eventuate clearly in the edification of the general body of believers.

4. "They tend to cultivate the spirit of humility." Irving said: "The chief reason of this ordinance is to make void and empty the eloquence and arguments, and other natural ornaments of human speech, and to show that God edifies the soul, in a manner wholly independent thereof, by direct communications of the Holy Ghost, which is the milk of our babyhood, the power in the word to nourish any soul. . . . Because this gift of tongues and prophesying, which is its fruit, are the constant demonstrations of God dwelling in a man, and teaching him all spiritual things by the Holy Ghost, without help of any third thing or third party, to the great undervaluing and entire disannulling of the powers of

natural reason and speech as a fountain-head of divine instruction: therefore they must ever be fatal to the pride of intellect, to the prudence and wisdom of the world, to the scheming, counseling, and wise dealing of the natural man; to all mere philosophers, theologians, poets, sages, wits of every name; yea, makes war upon them, brings them to naught, and utterly defeats their pretensions to do anything for man in the way of the glorious rest and refreshing. It is needful, therefore, that all scribes and learned men, philosophers and statesmen, and men of worldly gifts, and all men whatsoever, should become as little children; as those who are weaned from the milk and drawn from the breast, in order to be fed and nourished of God in this spiritual way, which is the only real way, and of which speaking with tongues is only the manifestation."[1]

If all of this is true, and the possession

[1] Edward Irving, "Works," Vol. V, pp. 557-559.

of the gift of tongues fosters the spirit of humility in the individual upon whom it is bestowed, we may grant that in so far it is a benefit to him. It has seemed to us, however, that the gift might work the other way. Some have suggested that it is the only sufficient evidence of the possession of and by the Holy Spirit, and this feeling has tended to form a class division among believers—the formation of an exclusive and superior caste who were tempted to deny the Christian experience of those not gifted as themselves. This is not a necessary, but it is a frequent, accompaniment of the phenomenon. Possibly it ought to tend to humility, but it may, and it frequently does, tend to pride.

5. "They are the proof of a spiritual Church, and therefore ought to be desired by all at all times." We quote again from Irving at this point: "The true reason why the gift of tongues hath ceased to be in the Church is, the exalta-

tion of the natural methods of teaching above, or into copartnery with, the teaching of the Holy Ghost, the meanness of our idea, and the weakness of our faith, concerning the oneness of Christ glorified with His Church on earth: the unworthiness of our doctrine concerning the person and office of the Holy Ghost, to knit up the believer into complete oneness with Christ, every thread and filament of our mortal humanity with His humanity, immortal and glorious; to bring down into the Church a complete Christ, and keep Him there, ever filling her bosom, and working in her members; the shortcoming of our knowledge, in respect to the gifts themselves; our having ceased to lament their absence, and to pray for their return; our want of fasting, and humiliation, and crying unto the Lord; our contentment to be without them; our base and false theories to account for their absence, without taking guilt to ourselves. Any one of these causes were

sufficient, all of them are far more than sufficient, to account for their long absence from the bosom of the Church. These are the true reasons; and the commonly given reason, that they were designed only for a short time, is utterly false and most pernicious."[2]

This sets forth clearly the usual assumption in their favor. The Apostolic Church was a very spiritual Church, and it had these gifts. We ought to strive for the same degree of spirituality and for the same gifts. They can be had by fasting and prayer. Therefore it is to our shame that we do not have them. We say in reply that the Apostolic Church was not the ideal Church, and that we have many Churches to-day that are more spiritual than the Church at Corinth was and far more enlightened than the disciples at Jerusalem were or the people at Cæsarea and Ephesus who had the gift of tongues. There are much

[2] Edward Irving, "Works," Vol. V, p. 560.

better tokens of spirituality than the display of these gifts. We covet the better gifts and are well content with the best. We can do without the least, as long as we have the better and best.

Chapter VI

BEST GENERAL ATTITUDE TOWARD THE GIFT OF TONGUES

As an illustration of a possible sane and sensible attitude toward all phenomena of this character, I quote John Wesley's Journal for Sunday, November 25, 1759: "I observed a remarkable difference, since I was here in Everton before, as to the manner of the work. None now were in trances, none cried out, none fell down or were convulsed: only some trembled exceedingly, a low murmur was heard, and many were refreshed with the multitude of peace. The danger *was*, to regard extraordinary circumstances too much, such as outcries, convulsions, visions, trances, as if these were essential to the inward work, so that it could not go on without them. Perhaps the danger

is, to regard them too little; to condemn them altogether; to imagine they had nothing of God in them, and were a hindrance to His work. Whereas the truth is: 1. God suddenly and strongly convinced many that they were lost sinners, the natural consequence whereof were sudden outcries and strong bodily convulsions; 2. To strengthen and encourage them that believed, and to make His work more apparent, He favored several of them with divine dreams, others with trances and visions; 3. In some of these instances, after a time, nature mixed with grace; 4. Satan likewise mimicked this work of God in order to discredit the whole work; and yet it is not wise to give up this part any more than to give up the whole. At first it was, doubtless, wholly from God. It is partly so at this day; and He will enable us to discern how far, in every case, the work is pure, and where it mixes or degenerates. . . . The shadow is no

disparagement of the substance, nor the counterfeit of the real diamond."[1]

There is nothing in that paragraph which deals directly with the speaking with tongues. I do not find any record that the distinctive Methodist meetings were ever visited by this phenomenon. The French Prophets of London, and their followers, the successors of the movement among the peasants of the Cevennes, made a good deal of trouble for Wesley, and some Methodists were influenced by them; but the Methodist movement cut them off in the very beginning, and their later extravagances can not be laid to the account of Methodism. We take it, however, that the quotation from Wesley's Journal sets forth his general attitude toward all phenomena of this character; and if it had been necessary he would have included the speaking with tongues along with the visions and trances and con-

[1] "Wesley's Works," Vol. IV, p. 49.

vulsions. The best general attitude toward them will be one of *consistent tolerance and persistent testing, a recognition of their occasional and individual and proportionate value, together with a constant insistence upon their orderly and edifying use.*

Chapter VII

FOUR PAULINE PRINCIPLES OF CONTROL

1. Proportionate Value.—The Church at Corinth was setting chief value upon the gift of tongues. It was a talkative Church to begin with, and it had a tendency to run mostly to tongue. The power of speaking in unknown tongues seemed to it the highest proof of spiritual possession and inspiration. Paul does not minify the gift of tongues in itself, but *he puts it at the bottom of the list of spiritual gifts.* He says, "In the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I might instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue" (1 Cor. 14: 19). A word of testimony unto edification in a public meeting is worth *two thousand times more*

than a word in an unknown tongue. Every word of a helpful sermon is worth two thousand times as much as a word in an unknown tongue. That disproportion, one to two thousand, is too great for any one who is capable of sane and sensible discourse to be tempted to any voluntary indulgence in a glossolalia.

Paul seems to suggest in this immediate context that the gift of tongues had to do with the infancy experience of the individual and of the Church, and was not to be desired or cultivated in their maturer life. He says, "Brethren, be not children in mind: yet in malice be ye babes, but in mind be men" (1 Cor. 14: 20). Pentecost marked the birth of the Christian Church. The disciples at Cæsarea and at Ephesus who had the gift of tongues had just accepted Christianity, and the experience marked the first transports of their joy. There is no indication in the Book of Acts that the glossolalia formed a part of the

regular worship of the Christian Church, or was ever experienced except at the very beginning of the Christian life. *It was a childish transport, not a mature development.* It was natural to children and could be excused in them. It was unnatural in maturity, and to desire it was childish and to exercise it was babyish. *Men* ought to speak understandingly. This seems to be the position of Paul, as far as the public services were concerned. He would two thousand times rather have a prophecy in a public meeting than a powwow. The Church ought to advance out of the kindergarten stage into the more advanced and more self-controlled and more profitable higher classes. Where this proportionate value of the gift of tongues is plainly preached and insisted upon, it is not likely that many will exercise it or that older and maturer Christians will find any attraction in it.

2. EDIFICATION.—"Let all things be

done unto edifying" (1 Cor. 14:26.) The public service is not held in order that any individual may make a display of his particular gifts, but that the whole congregation may be blessed. Whatever tends to build them all up in spiritual things must have the right of way. Let that be the test of value and let that decide the right to exercise any gift, not the marvel of it, but the usefulness of it. If it failed to edify the Church, let it be omitted. What profited the individual could be practiced in private. The public practice of gifts must be of profit to all, and not to any one alone. Let this rule be rigorously applied to any exercise of the gift of tongues, and it will occasion no trouble in any community. Any sincere Christian will be willing to bring his gift to this test of usefulness, and as soon as he or the Church community is convinced that his exercise of the gift does not tend to edification and general benefit, he will

gladly stop its public use. To refuse to do so would be to put his own pleasure or edification above that of the many involved.

3. Orderliness.—"Let all things be done decently and in order" (1 Cor. 14:40). This is the conclusion of the whole matter with Paul. "God is not a God of confusion, but of peace" (1 Cor. 14:33). Anything that makes a public assembly seem like a room full of maniacs or anything that sounds like the squalling of an infant department more than the orderly discourse of reasonable men, is not from God and can claim no divine authority. If there is to be any speaking with tongues, let two or, at most, three speak, and let them take turns. They must not talk all at the same time. That is distracting and tumultuous and disgraceful. A Christian meeting is not to be turned into a Bedlam under any circumstances. Only those are to speak aloud with tongues who can themselves

interpret or who have an interpreter at hand. Otherwise they must keep still (1 Cor. 14:27, 28). The irregularities of all the later exhibitions of the speaking with tongues would have been avoided if these rules laid down by the Apostle Paul had been observed. *Wherever Pauline authority is claimed for the exercise of this gift, let the Pauline discipline be maintained.* It would change the character of most of the meetings in the modern Tongues Movement most radically.

4. Self-Control.—The position usually taken by those who speak with tongues is that the Holy Spirit is in absolute control of their tongues and beings, and therefore any interference with their speech or action is an interference with Him. A mere man might submit to the judgment of his brethren, but who are these brethren that they should propose to regulate and discipline the Holy Ghost? The practical position of these enthusiasts is that the more evidence

they give of the loss of their self-control, the more evidence there is that they are under the control of the Holy Spirit. The more they disclaim personal responsibility, the more they claim that the Holy Spirit is responsible. This is directly contrary to the dictum of Paul. He says, "The spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets" (1 Cor. 14: 32). It was a heathen conception that possession by the Spirit was compatible only with the abnegation of the reason. The Christian conception is that possession by the Holy Spirit simply strengthens and enforces the natural powers.

The Holy Spirit is the spirit of power and the spirit of love and the spirit of a sound mind (2 Tim. 1: 7). Too often the spirit of power has been coveted and exercised with too little or none of the spirit of love. The gift of speaking with tongues is consistent with a large degree of selfishness. Too often the spirit of

power and of love has been possessed and exercised with too little or none of the spirit of a sound mind. The Holy Spirit is manifest just as much in a sound mind as in power and in love. Insanity and spirituality have nothing in common; but Christianity and common sense are near allied.

It is a mistake to think that the Holy Spirit is more interested or more active in abnormal experiences or our unconscious states than He is in the reasonable conduct of our ordinary life. "The operation of the Holy Spirit must not be looked for in any abnormal, violent, or mysterious psychical experiences. Such convulsions of the soul have, indeed, in some cases, marked the awakening into a new life; like a volcanic upheaval, they have brought to the surface hidden strata of the subconscious life; but generally it is by the small voice, not by the earthquake or the fire, that God speaks to us. And the wish to

strip ourselves of our own personality, to empty ourselves that God may fill the void, is a mistake. It is when we are most ourselves that we are nearest to God."[1] Tennyson, in his "Œnone," has stated the truth well,

"Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control,
These three alone lead life to sovereign power."

The highest Christian experience is not attained through the abandonment of one's own faculties, the abnegation of one's own personality, the surrender of one's own self-consciousness. A man may be wholly sanctified without losing a particle of his self-respect, self-knowledge, or self-control. A *thoroughly* consecrated man will use *all* the good judgment and the common sense he has in the discreet regulation of his life. He will not cast himself down from any height he may have attained because the devil has suggested that if he fling away his own personality he will be borne

[1] Inge, "Faith and Knowledge," pp. 167, 168.

up miraculously on angels' wings. *Any temptation to let ourselves go and sink into unconsciousness is not sanctioned anywhere in the Word of God. It is contrary to the whole genius of the Christian faith.*

God neither paralyzes nor destroys the human will or the human reason in any case. He quickens them into new energy and gives them new power. He does not abolish man's understanding with any of His gifts. He sanctifies it and uses it to His own glory. The Spirit of a sound mind will never make anybody talk or act like a maniac. The Holy Spirit puts a premium upon sanity and soberness and good judgment and common sense and clear thinking. Let Him have the right of way and the gift of tongues will be proportionately valued, exercised to edification, submissive to discipline, and subject to self-control whenever and wherever it may be manifested. *It will be sane and serviceable, or it will be silent in the Churches,*

Chapter VIII

CONCLUSION

On the whole, then, our conclusion must be that the gift of tongues is of such comparative insignificance that no one need covet it in these days, and that it is a gift belonging to the immature rather than the mature development of the Church, and that *as an ecstatic experience* it ought not to be *cultivated* because of the nervous disorders that will inevitably ensue in any prolonged indulgence in it, and that whenever it occurs in any religious meeting, the responsible leader of that meeting ought to see to it that it is submissive to discipline and subject to self-control.

It is an interesting fact that when physical prostrations were frequent in John Wesley's meetings Charles Wesley

preached upon one occasion, and quietly informed his audience before he began that any one who was stricken down during the service would be removed from the room just as quietly and as expeditiously as possible; and after that announcement no one was stricken. Usually a few quiet words of suggestion from the leader will dispose of all such phenomena.

When the possessors of the gift of tongues refuse to recognize any Church authority, and are inclined to ignore the injunction that all things shall be done decently and in order, and are unwilling to submit to the Pauline restrictions upon the use of the gift, they brand *their* gift at once as un-Christian and its exercise as un-Scriptural; and they should be disciplined accordingly. The gift of tongues must be recognized as a possible accompaniment of any ecstatic Christian or pagan experience. It should never be allowed to become the prom-

inent feature of any Christian movement. It should be discouraged under all normal conditions everywhere. It is doubtful whether it ought to be encouraged under any conditions anywhere. In the Church of to-day it is less a blessing to be desired than an affliction to be endured. Let it cease as soon as may be; but let love abide in all our dealings with it. "Whether there be tongues, they shall cease. . . . But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love."

The Manifold Message of the Gospel

Edited by CHAS. M. STUART

IN this book we have a series of popular studies in the books of the New Testament. These studies are by such well-known pastors and professors as Gillies of Minneapolis; Birney of Boston; Hayes and Stuart of Garrett; Walker of Ohio Wesleyan; Stearns of Wesley College in Dakota; Plantz of Appleton, and others.

The purpose is to give in brief and untechnical language the setting and the circumstances of the writing, with suitable sketch of the author and proper outline of each book.

The work is thoroughly well done according to the purpose set forth. The studies first appeared in the Northwestern. In book form they will have a much wider appeal, and will be in demand both for personal reading and as a textbook for popular class study.

Size, 12mo (5x7½ inches).
Pages, 236. Binding, cloth.
Price, net, $1.50

S0-BSX-147